

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-5 have amended. Claim 1 has been allowed. Reexamination and reconsideration of claims 2-5 are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant has amended claim 2 by deleting the term “chassis” and replacing it with “slide tray”. This is consistent with the specification which notes that “the slide tray 210 and the rotary tray 220 constitute the chassis and the disk tray, respectively, which are referred to in the present invention.” (See paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12). Hence, claim 2 now recites that the slide tray has a plurality of rollers which support the disk tray rotatably on a back side of the disk tray. And, a support shaft structure urges the disk tray toward the slide tray while supporting the disk tray rotatably.

In the Office Action, independent claim 2 was rejected as being anticipated by KUROSU (US 5,555,227). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

As noted above, Applicant’s invention provides a slide tray having a plurality of rollers which support the disk tray rotatably on a back side of the disk tray. By contrast, KUROSU has no such rollers that support the disk tray 3 rotatably on a back side thereof. Rather, the rollers 83 and 84 noted in the Office Action are used to support the back side of the “slide tray” (not the “disk tray”) as clearly shown in Figure 5. Moreover, these rollers 83, 84 only linearly (not “rotatably”) support the slide tray allowing it to move forward and backward as shown by arrows “F” and “G” of Figures 6 and 7.

Moreover, KUROSU does not disclose a support shaft structure which urges the disk tray toward the slide tray while supporting the disk tray rotatably

about an axis of the disk tray relative to the slide tray. Hence, Applicant submits independent claim 2 is patentable over KUROSU.

Regarding dependent claim 3, this claim was rejected in the Office Action as being obvious of KUROSU in view of LIU (US 5,251,192). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

As noted above, and as acknowledged in the Office Action, KUROSU does not disclose a support shaft structure having a spring which expands and contracts in the axial direction of the disk tray. Accordingly, the Examiner cites to LIU for allegedly remedying this deficiency.

However, Applicant has clarified claim 3 to make clear that one end of its spring is spaced a predetermined distance from the slide tray and positioned there, while an opposite end of the spring acts against the disk tray in a vicinity of the disk tray axis from the side opposite to the slide tray. As shown in Applicant's preferred embodiment of Figure 5, one end of spring 320 is spaced a predetermined distance from the slide tray 210 while an opposite end (lower end of spring shown in Figure 5) of the spring acts against the disk tray 220 in a vicinity of the disk tray axis.

By contrast, LIU does not disclose or suggest the use of a spring that acts against the disk tray in a vicinity of the disk tray axis. Rather, LIU's spring 25 is utilized only to urge open the cover 3 as is clearly shown in Figures 3, 5 and 7. Indeed, Figures 5 and 7 show that the "opposite end of the spring 25" does not act against the disk tray, but rather only against the upright post 24 (see col. 3, lines 40-44). Figures 5 and 7 clearly show that the upright post 24 is spaced apart from the disk tray, such that the spring 25 cannot act against the disk

tray, but rather acts against the CD cap 3 to open same. The upright post 24 as shown in the figures is held directly by the base 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits dependent claim 3 is also separately patentable over KUROSU in view of LIU. Further, claims 4 and 5 recite specific structures of the disk tray and slide tray so as to allow an effective warping of the disk tray in a concave manner such that upon assembly the warping thereof is inverted to eliminate undulation and stabilize the rotating torque of the disk tray. Neither KUROSU nor LIU disclose or suggest a feature. Hence, claim 4 is also submitted to be separately patentable thereof.

Lastly, dependent claim 5 recites a recess formed as a depression in the slide tray in a direction away from the disk tray. Hereto, this structure facilitates the downwardly convex warping of the disk tray to eliminate undulations thereof so as to stabilize the rotating torque (see page 17, second paragraph). Hence, claim 5 is also submitted to be separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is solicited.


Summarizing, Applicant has made an important contribution to the art to which the present subject matter pertains, for which no counterpart is shown in any of the art or combination of same. The invention is fully set forth and carefully delimited in all claims in this case. Under the patent statute, Applicant should not be deprived of the protection to which he is entitled for this contribution. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that favorable reconsideration and an early notice of allowance be provided for all remaining claims.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #3064YO/50999).

Respectfully submitted,

October 28, 2003

  
Jeffrey D. Sanok  
Registration No. 32,169

CROWELL & MORING, LLP  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

JDS:pct